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#### Abstract

MPEG-2 is widely used as video coding standard for contents such as DVD or digital video broadcasting, DVB. It defines a layered structure, composing three different types of frames into groups for temporal and spatial compression of video information.

In this paper we present an exhaustive analysis av various MPEG streams, taken from original DVDs. The purpose is to get a more clear picture about what are valid assumptions about MPEG. The analysis showed that many common assumptions, in particular about relation of frame sizes, and equal importance of frames, do not hold in the general case.


## 1 Introduction

MPEG, the Moving Picture Experts Group standard for coded representation of digital audio and video, is used in a wide range of applications. In particular MPEG-2 has become the coding standard for digital video streams in consumer content and devices, such as DVD movies and digital television set top boxes for DVB, terrestrial TV broadcasts or via satellite. It should be noted that MPEG is a standard for the format, a syntax, not for the actual encoding: the same content, e.g., a movie, can be encoded in many ways while adhering to the same standard. In fact, MPEG encoding has to meet diverse demands, depending, e.g., on the medium of distribution, such as overall size in the case of DVD, maximum bitrate for DVB , or speed of encoding for live broadcasts.

In the case of DVD and DVB, sophisticated provisions to apply spatial and temporal compression are applied, while a very simple, but quickly coded stream will be used for the live broadcast. Consequently, video streams, and in particular their decoding demands will vary greatly between media, but also different types of contents or even different scenes within the same movie.

MPEG-2 video streams have a layered structure. The layer we are considering here is the picture layer, where the video data is organized in Group of Pictures(GOP), i.e., a sequence of pictures that consist of a number of frames. The three types of frames are $I$ frames (intra-coded pictures), $P$ frames (predicted pictures), and $B$ frames bi-directionally predicted pictures. Simply speaking, $I$ frames contain full pictures and are independent, $P$ frames build a full picture using a previous $I$ or $P$ frame as reference, and $B$ frames contain incremental changes to a full picture, based on both previous and later frames.

In this paper we present results of an analysis of realistic MPEG streams of DVD movies and match the analysis results against common assumptions. For example, an intuitive conclusion is that $I$ will be the largest frames, followed by $P$ and $B$ frames, and frames have similar sizes within their respective frame type. While true on average, such assumptions do not hold for a considerable number of cases. The analysis of realistic streams presented in this paper shows, e.g., a case with $9 \%$ GOPs in which $P$ have the largest size, and $1 \%$ of $B$ frames, which corresponds to roughly to 8 and 1 minutes, resp., in a 90 minute feature film. Clearly, such deviations from average cannot be ignored.

The analysis showed that many common assumptions, in particular about relation of frame sizes, and equal importance of frames, do not hold in the general case.

## 2 MPEG Video Streams Properties

A complete description of the MPEG compression scheme is beyond the scope of this paper. For details on MPEG see e.g. [1, 4, 3]. Here we will focus on the MPEG video stream structure, and see how it can be analyzed and scheduled. In this work, we describe the most important characteristics of a MPEG-2 video stream. The text presented in this subsection is sumarized in figure 1 .

### 2.1 Frame types

The MPEG-2 standard defines three types of frames, $I, P$ and $B$.
$I$ frames or intra frames are simply frames coded as still images. They contain absolute picture data and are self-contained, meaning that they require no additional information for decoding. $I$ frames have only spatial redundancy providing the least compression among all frame types. Therefore they are not transmitted more frequently than necessary.
$P$ frames The second kind of frames are $P$ or predicted frames. They are forward predicted from the most recently reconstructed $I$ or $P$ frame, i.e., they contain a set of instructions to convert the previous picture into the current one. $P$ frames are not self-contained, meaning that if the previous reference frame is lost, decoding is impossible. On average, $P$ frames require roughly half the data of an $I$ frame, but our analysis also showed that this is not the case for the significant number of cases.
$B$ frames The third type is $B$ or bi-directionally predicted frames. They use both forward and backward prediction, i.e., a $B$ frame can be decoded from a previous $I$ or $P$ frame, and/or from a later $I$ or $P$ frame. They contain vectors describing where in an earlier or later pictures data should be taken from. They also contain transformation coefficients that provide the correction. $B$ frames are never predicted from each other, only from $I$ or $P$ frames. As a consequence, no other frames depend on $B$ frames. $B$ frames require resource-intensive compression techniques such as Motion Compensation and Motion Estimation but they also exhibit the highest compression ratio, on average typically requiring one quarter the data of an $I$ picture. Again, our analysis showed that this does not hold for a significant number of cases.

### 2.2 Group of Pictures

Predictive coding, i.e., the current frame is predicted from the previous one, cannot be used indefinitely, as it is prone to error propagation. A further problem is that it becomes impossible to decode the transmission if reception begins part-way through. In real video signals, cuts or edits can be present across which there is little redundancy. In the absence of redundancy over a cut, there is nothing to be done but to send from time to time a new picture information in absolute form, i.e., an $I$ frame. As $I$ decoding needs no previous frame, decoding can begin at $I$ coded information, for example, allowing the viewer to switch channels. An $I$ frame together with all of the frames before the next $I$ frame form a group of pictures (GOP). The GOP length is flexible, but 12 or 15 frames is a common value. Furthermore, it is common industrial practice to have a fixed pattern (e.g. $I B B P B B P B B P B B$ ). However, more advanced encoders will attempt to optimize the placement of the three frame types according to local sequence characteristics in the
context of more global characteristics. Note that the last $B$ frame in a GOP requires the $I$ frame in the next GOP for decoding and so the GOPs are not truly independent. Independence can be obtained by creating a closed GOP which may contain $B$ frames but ends with a $P$ frame.

a) Frame types and Group of Pictures

b) Forward $(P)$ and bidirectional $(B)$ prediction

c) Changes in frame sequence

Figure 1: MPEG-2 video stream characteristics

### 2.3 Transmission vs display order

As we mentioned above, $B$ frames are predicted from two $I$ or $P$ frames, one in the past and one in the future. Clearly information in the future has yet to be transmitted and so is not normally available to the decoder. MPEG gets around the problem by sending frames in the "wrong" order. The frames are sent out of sequence and temporarily stored. Figure 1-c shows that although the original frame sequence is $I B B P \ldots$, this is transmitted as $I P B B \ldots$, so that the future frame is already in the decoder before bi-directional decoding begins. Picture reordering requires additional memory at the encoder and decoder and delay in both of them to put the order right again. The number of bi-directionally coded frames between $I$ and $P$ frames must be restricted to reduce cost and minimize delay, if delay is an issue.

## 3 Analysis of Various MPEG streams

We have analyzed a number of realistic MPEG streams to get a more clear picture about which assumption about MPEG are valid. Some types of videos are more sensitive for frames dropping. For example, dropping 4 frames in an action video reduces half of the
original video quality, $50 \%$, while only $10 \%$ in a cartoon video [2]. Therefore we have analysed different types of movies such as action movie, drama, cartoons, etc.

### 3.1 Simulation environment

We have analysed the contents of original DVD movies. The movies were not encrypted or copy protected in any sense, which means that we managed to rip their context on a hard drive by using only legal ripping software, i.e., the one that will not try to break the CSS protection code on a DVD.

Ripped MPEG streams were analysed by an own-written piece of software (C-program). It takes approximately 10 minutes to analyse a 100 minutes long MPEG stream on a PC computer with the processor speed of $1,5 \mathrm{GHz}$.

### 3.2 Analysed DVD movies

An overview of the movies we analyzed is summarized in table $1 . N$ and $M$ refer to the GOP length and distance between reference frames respective, e.g. $\operatorname{GOP}(12,3)$ means $I$-to- $I$ distance is 12 , while $I$-to- $P$ and $P$-to- $P$ distance is 3 .

### 3.3 Analysis results: Mission Impossible 2

Here is the data for the movie Mission Impossible 2. Table 2 sumarizes GOP and frame size properties for the movie. Minumum, maximum and average size is given in bits.

The size ration between average values for respective frame type is $I: P: B=4: 2: 1$, which means that on average $I$ frames are twice as big as the $P$ frames, and 4 times bigger than the $B$ frames. However, this does not hold for a significant number of cases, which is depicted in table 3.

For example, in "Mission Impossible 2" we have a case with $10 \%$ GOPs in which $P$ have the largest size, and $1 \%$ of $B$ frames, which corresponds roughly to 13 and 1.5 minutes, resp, in a 90 minute feature film. Clearly, such deviations from average cannot be ignored. Furthermore we can see from table 3 that frames in a GOP are not sorted according to their bitsize, e.g., in $81 \%$ of the cases, the $P$ frame that is closest to the $I$ frame was not the largest among all $P$ frames in the GOP.

We have also analysed the distribution of the frame sizes. We have divided the range between minimum and maximum frame size for respective frame type into ten size intervals, and identified the number of frames in respective interval. In that way we can e.g say that the majority of frames have bitsize between some X and Y . This is depicted in figure 2.

For example, from figure 2 we can see that $88 \%$ of the $I$ frames has bitsize between 197737 and 790684 bits ( $\approx 200-800 \mathrm{kB}$ ), which is a quite large interval. The assumptions about MPEG based on average frame size will not hold in this case, since the significant number of frames will have twice as large repective twice as small bitsize, compared to the average frame size (which is $\approx 500 \mathrm{kB}$ ).

| Movie title | Genre | Length | Fps | Resolution | Mbit/s | GOP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mission Impossible 2 | Action | 118 min | 25 | $720 \times 576$ | 9800 | $(12,3)$ |
| Leaving Las Vegas | Drama | 107 min | 25 | $720 \times 576$ | 8700 | $(12,3)$ |
| Chicken Run | Cartoon | 104 min | 25 | $720 \times 576$ | 6000 | $(12,3)$ |
| The Usual Suspect | Thriller | 106 min | 30 | $720 \times 480$ | 9800 | $(12,3)$ |
| The Matrix | Action | 122 min | 30 | $720 \times 480$ | 7500 | $(12,3)$ |
| New Year's Concert | Music | 120 min | 25 | $720 \times 576$ | 7000 | $(12,3)$ |
| The Sea | Doc. | 55 min | 30 | $720 \times 480$ | 6500 | $(12,3)$ |

Table 1: Analyzed MPEG streams

| Item | Count | Minimum | Maximum | Average | Std deviation |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 16873 | 88 | 1976584 | 506109 | 187598 |
| P | 49679 | 16 | 1216000 | 234821 | 109889 |
| B | 112860 | 32 | 769048 | 148204 | 57615 |
| GOP | 16873 | 88 | 7541496 | 2222249 | 746767 |

Table 2: Mission Impossible 2 - Bitsizes for frames and GOPs

| GOP property | Nr of GOPs | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Open GOPs | 12900 | $76 \%$ |
| Closed GOPs | 3973 | $24 \%$ |
| GOPs with normal length (12) | 12991 | $77 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Largest frame $I$ | 15061 | $89 \%$ |
| Largest frame $P$ | 1658 | $10 \%$ |
| Largest frame $B$ | 154 | $1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| GOPs where $P>I$ | 5256 | $31 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>I$ | 4442 | $26 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>P$ | 6545 | $39 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $P>$ some previous $P$ in the GOP | 13609 | $81 \%$ |
| $B>$ some previous $B$ in the GOP | 16326 | $97 \%$ |

Table 3: Mission Impossible 2 - GOP properties

| Interval | From | To | Nr of I | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 88 | 197737 | 876 | $5,2 \%$ |
| 2 | 197737 | 395386 | 2190 | $13,0 \%$ |
| 3 | 395386 | 593035 | 9410 | $55,8 \%$ |
| 4 | 593035 | 790684 | 3137 | $18,6 \%$ |
| 5 | 790684 | 988333 | 426 | $2,5 \%$ |
| 6 | 988333 | 1185982 | 129 | $0,8 \%$ |
| 7 | 1185982 | 1383631 | 79 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 8 | 1383631 | 1581280 | 51 | $0,3 \%$ |
| 9 | 1581280 | 1778929 | 23 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 10 | 1778929 | 1976584 | 6 | $0,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of P | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 16 | 121614 | 6377 | $12,8 \%$ |
| 2 | 121614 | 243212 | 22355 | $45,0 \%$ |
| 3 | 243212 | 364810 | 14460 | $29,1 \%$ |
| 4 | 364810 | 486408 | 5496 | $11,1 \%$ |
| 5 | 486408 | 608006 | 857 | $1,7 \%$ |
| 6 | 608006 | 729604 | 102 | $0,2 \%$ |
| 7 | 729604 | 851202 | 17 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 851202 | 972800 | 11 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 972800 | 1094398 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 1094398 | 1216000 | 1 | $0,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of B | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 76933 | 7365 | $6,5 \%$ |
| 2 | 76933 | 153834 | 59938 | $53,1 \%$ |
| 3 | 153834 | 230735 | 35827 | $31,7 \%$ |
| 4 | 230735 | 307636 | 8370 | $7,4 \%$ |
| 5 | 307636 | 384537 | 1195 | $1,1 \%$ |
| 6 | 384537 | 461438 | 113 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 7 | 461438 | 538339 | 32 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 538339 | 615240 | 13 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 615240 | 692141 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 692141 | 769048 | 2 | $0,0 \%$ |



Figure 2: Mission Impossible 2 - Size distribution for I, P and B frames

### 3.4 Analysis results: Leaving Las Vegas

The GOP and frame sizes for the movie Leaving Las Vegas are presented in table 4.
The GOP properties are described in table 5 and the size distribution is shown in figure 3 .

### 3.5 Analysis results: Chicken Run

The size data and GOP properties for the cartoon Chicken Run is presented in tables 6 and 7. The size distribution is shown in figure 4 .

### 3.6 Analysis results: The Usual Suspect

The size data and GOP properties for the movie The Usual Suspect can be found in in tables 8 and 9 . The size distribution is depicted in figure 5.

### 3.7 Analysis results: The Matrix

The GOP and frame sizes for the movie The Matrix are presented in table 10. The GOP properties are described in table 11 and the size distribution is shown in figure 6 .

### 3.8 Analysis results: New Year's Concert

The size data and GOP properties for the cartoon New Year's Concert is presented in tables 12 and 13. The size distribution is shown in figure 7.

### 3.9 Analysis results: The Sea

The GOP and frame sizes for the movie The Sea are sumarized in table 14. The GOP properties are described in table 15 and the size distribution is shown in figure 8 .

| Item | Count | Minimum | Maximum | Average | Std deviation |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 13716 | 136 | 1469848 | 471886 | 140329 |
| P | 52860 | 32 | 1009832 | 231145 | 76835 |
| B | 106478 | 32 | 636416 | 152435 | 45746 |
| GOP | 13716 | 136 | 7185768 | 2543520 | 627856 |

Table 4: Leaving Las Vegas - Bitsizes for frames and GOPs

| GOP property | Number of GOPs | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Open GOPs | 13381 | $98 \%$ |
| Closed GOPs | 335 | $2 \%$ |
| GOPs with normal length (12) | 12573 | $92 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Largest frame $I$ | 12904 | $94 \%$ |
| Largest frame $P$ | 758 | $6 \%$ |
| Largest frame $B$ | 54 | $0,4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| GOPs where $P>I$ | 786 | $6 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>I$ | 230 | $2 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>P$ | 5072 | $37 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $P>$ some previous $P$ in the GOP | 11481 | $84 \%$ |
| $B>$ some previous $B$ in the GOP | 13715 | $100 \%$ |

Table 5: Leaving Las Vegas - GOP properties

| Frame type | Nr of frames | Min | Max | Avg | Std dev |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 10139 | 57424 | 1121216 | 674549 | 216068 |
| P | 30406 | 1272 | 1097336 | 255551 | 133372 |
| B | 80861 | 1264 | 891240 | 115185 | 53982 |
| GOP | 10139 | 69712 | 4680200 | 2360795 | 622665 |

Table 6: Chicken Run - Bitsizes for frames and GOPs

| GOP property | Number of GOPs | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Open GOPs | 10123 | $100 \%$ |
| Closed GOPs | 16 | $0,2 \%$ |
| GOPs with normal length (12) | 10056 | $99 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Largest frame $I$ | 9291 | $92 \%$ |
| Largest frame $P$ | 842 | $8 \%$ |
| Largest frame $B$ | 14 | $0,1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| GOPs where $P>I$ | 841 | $8 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>I$ | 79 | $1 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>P$ | 1180 | $12 \%$ |
| $P>$ some previous $P$ in the GOP |  |  |
| $B>$ some previous $B$ in the GOP | 8260 | $81 \%$ |

Table 7: Chicken Run - GOP properties

| Interval | From | To | Nr of I | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 136 | 146985 | 188 | $1,4 \%$ |
| 2 | 146985 | 293970 | 1089 | $7,9 \%$ |
| 3 | 293970 | 440955 | 4503 | $32,8 \%$ |
| 4 | 440955 | 587940 | 5281 | $38,5 \%$ |
| 5 | 587940 | 734925 | 2231 | $16,3 \%$ |
| 6 | 734925 | 881910 | 344 | $2,5 \%$ |
| 7 | 881910 | 1028895 | 63 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 8 | 1028895 | 1175880 | 14 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 9 | 1175880 | 1322865 | 1 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 1322865 | 1469850 | 2 | $0,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of P Percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 100984 | 2206 | $4,2 \%$ |
| 2 | 100984 | 201968 | 15999 | $30,3 \%$ |
| 3 | 201968 | 302952 | 26630 | $50,4 \%$ |
| 4 | 302952 | 403936 | 7098 | $13,4 \%$ |
| 5 | 403936 | 504920 | 618 | $1,2 \%$ |
| 6 | 504920 | 605904 | 252 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 7 | 605904 | 706888 | 35 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 8 | 706888 | 807872 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 807872 | 908856 | 0 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 908856 | 1009840 | 2 | $0,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of B | Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 63642 | 914 | $0,9 \%$ |
| 2 | 63642 | 127284 | 14630 | $13,7 \%$ |
| 3 | 127284 | 190926 | 25275 | $23,7 \%$ |
| 4 | 190926 | 254568 | 8385 | $7,9 \%$ |
| 5 | 254568 | 318210 | 693 | $0,7 \%$ |
| 6 | 318210 | 381852 | 54 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 7 | 381852 | 445494 | 12 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 445494 | 509136 | 2 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 509136 | 572778 | 0 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 572778 | 636420 | 0 | $0,0 \%$ |



Figure 3: Leaving Las Vegas - Size distribution for I, P and B frames

| Item | Count | Minimum | Maximum | Average | Std deviation |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 13404 | 2856 | 1282720 | 514744 | 174307 |
| P | 40088 | 32 | 1204808 | 281867 | 92779 |
| B | 98868 | 32 | 762048 | 129537 | 48890 |
| GOP | 13404 | 13312 | 5896728 | 2324673 | 583043 |

Table 8: The Usual Suspect - Bitsizes for frames and GOPs

| Interval | From | To | Nr of I | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 57424 | 163803 | 207 | $2,0 \%$ |
| 2 | 163803 | 270182 | 165 | $1,6 \%$ |
| 3 | 270182 | 376561 | 643 | $6,3 \%$ |
| 4 | 376561 | 482940 | 948 | $9,4 \%$ |
| 5 | 482940 | 589319 | 1140 | $11,2 \%$ |
| 6 | 589319 | 695698 | 2056 | $20,3 \%$ |
| 7 | 695698 | 802077 | 2098 | $20,7 \%$ |
| 8 | 802077 | 908456 | 1494 | $14,7 \%$ |
| 9 | 908456 | 1014835 | 878 | $8,7 \%$ |
| 10 | 1014835 | 1121216 | 510 | $5,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of P | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1272 | 110878 | 2616 | $8,6 \%$ |
| 2 | 110878 | 220484 | 11245 | $37,0 \%$ |
| 3 | 220484 | 330090 | 9768 | $32,1 \%$ |
| 4 | 330090 | 439696 | 4473 | $14,7 \%$ |
| 5 | 439696 | 549302 | 1298 | $4,3 \%$ |
| 6 | 549302 | 658908 | 478 | $1,6 \%$ |
| 7 | 658908 | 768514 | 279 | $0,9 \%$ |
| 8 | 768514 | 878120 | 141 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 9 | 878120 | 987726 | 63 | $0,2 \%$ |
| 10 | 987726 | 1097336 | 45 | $0,1 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of B | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1264 | 90261 | 29767 | $36,8 \%$ |
| 2 | 90261 | 179258 | 41449 | $51,3 \%$ |
| 3 | 179258 | 268255 | 8605 | $10,6 \%$ |
| 4 | 268255 | 357252 | 941 | $1,2 \%$ |
| 5 | 357252 | 446249 | 83 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 6 | 446249 | 535246 | 9 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 7 | 535246 | 624243 | 5 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 624243 | 713240 | 0 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 713240 | 802237 | 1 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 802237 | 891240 | 1 | $0,0 \%$ |



Figure 4: Chicken Run - Size distribution for I, P and B frames

| GOP property | Number of GOPs | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Open GOPs | 11443 | $85 \%$ |
| Closed GOPs | 1961 | $15 \%$ |
| GOPs with normal length (12) | 11005 | $82 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Largest frame $I$ | 11874 | $89 \%$ |
| Largest frame $P$ | 1477 | $11 \%$ |
| Largest frame $B$ | 53 | $0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| GOPs where $P>I$ | 4253 | $32 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>I$ | 2035 | $15 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>P$ | 1112 | $8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $P>$ some previous $P$ in the GOP | 9587 | $72 \%$ |
| $B>$ some previous $B$ in the GOP | 13264 | $99 \%$ |

Table 9: The Usual Suspect - GOP properties

| Interval | From | To | Nr of I | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2856 | 130842 | 198 | $1,5 \%$ |
| 2 | 130842 | 258828 | 356 | $2,7 \%$ |
| 3 | 258828 | 386814 | 2238 | $16,7 \%$ |
| 4 | 386814 | 514800 | 4408 | $32,9 \%$ |
| 5 | 514800 | 642786 | 3422 | $25,5 \%$ |
| 6 | 642786 | 770772 | 1579 | $11,8 \%$ |
| 7 | 770772 | 898758 | 675 | $5,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 898758 | 1026744 | 289 | $2,2 \%$ |
| 9 | 1026744 | 1154730 | 88 | $0,7 \%$ |
| 10 | 1154730 | 1282720 | 12 | $0,1 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of P | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 120509 | 752 | $1,9 \%$ |
| 2 | 120509 | 240986 | 12809 | $32,0 \%$ |
| 3 | 240986 | 361463 | 20900 | $52,1 \%$ |
| 4 | 361463 | 481940 | 4428 | $11,0 \%$ |
| 5 | 481940 | 602417 | 793 | $2,0 \%$ |
| 6 | 602417 | 722894 | 253 | $0,6 \%$ |
| 7 | 722894 | 843371 | 103 | $0,3 \%$ |
| 8 | 843371 | 963848 | 33 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 9 | 963848 | 1084325 | 13 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 1084325 | 1204808 | 4 | $0,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of B | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 76233 | 8255 | $8,3 \%$ |
| 2 | 76233 | 152434 | 66744 | $67,5 \%$ |
| 3 | 152434 | 228635 | 21015 | $21,3 \%$ |
| 4 | 228635 | 304836 | 2016 | $2,0 \%$ |
| 5 | 304836 | 381037 | 439 | $0,4 \%$ |
| 6 | 381037 | 457238 | 161 | $0,2 \%$ |
| 7 | 457238 | 533439 | 202 | $0,2 \%$ |
| 8 | 533439 | 609640 | 25 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 609640 | 685841 | 7 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 685841 | 762048 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |



Figure 5: The Usual Suspect - Size distribution for I, P and B frames

| Item | Count | Minimum | Maximum | Average | Std deviation |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 14663 | 41104 | 760000 | 430088 | 70920 |
| P | 43920 | 1272 | 809016 | 249576 | 65226 |
| B | 117090 | 3184 | 664968 | 136725 | 41336 |
| GOP | 14667 | 76088 | 4322648 | 2269353 | 408220 |

Table 10: The Matrix - Bitsizes for frames and GOPs

| GOP property | Number of GOPs | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Open GOPs | 14664 | $100 \%$ |
| Closed GOPs | 23 | $0 \%$ |
| GOPs with normal length (12) | 14595 | $100 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Largest frame $I$ | 13665 | $93 \%$ |
| Largest frame $P$ | 954 | $7 \%$ |
| Largest frame $B$ | 48 | $0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| GOPs where $P>I$ | 2453 | $17 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>I$ | 449 | $3 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>P$ | 1491 | $10 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $P>$ some previous $P$ in the GOP | 7424 | $51 \%$ |
| $B>$ some previous $B$ in the GOP | 14662 | $100 \%$ |

Table 11: The Matrix - GOP properties

| Interval | From | To | Nr of I | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 41104 | 112993 | 53 | $0,4 \%$ |
| 2 | 112993 | 184882 | 42 | $0,3 \%$ |
| 3 | 184882 | 256771 | 156 | $1,1 \%$ |
| 4 | 256771 | 328660 | 653 | $4,5 \%$ |
| 5 | 328660 | 400549 | 3471 | $23,7 \%$ |
| 6 | 400549 | 472438 | 6529 | $44,5 \%$ |
| 7 | 472438 | 544327 | 3197 | $21,8 \%$ |
| 8 | 544327 | 616216 | 474 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 9 | 616216 | 688105 | 80 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 10 | 688105 | 760000 | 8 | $0,1 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of P | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1272 | 82046 | 159 | $0,4 \%$ |
| 2 | 82046 | 162820 | 2618 | $6,0 \%$ |
| 3 | 162820 | 243594 | 20183 | $46,0 \%$ |
| 4 | 243594 | 324368 | 15747 | $35,9 \%$ |
| 5 | 324368 | 405142 | 4294 | $9,8 \%$ |
| 6 | 405142 | 485916 | 707 | $1,6 \%$ |
| 7 | 485916 | 566690 | 150 | $0,3 \%$ |
| 8 | 566690 | 647464 | 43 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 9 | 647464 | 728238 | 14 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 728238 | 809016 | 5 | $0,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of B | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 3184 | 69362 | 2967 | $2,5 \%$ |
| 2 | 69362 | 135540 | 65311 | $55,8 \%$ |
| 3 | 135540 | 201718 | 39890 | $34,1 \%$ |
| 4 | 201718 | 267896 | 7782 | $6,6 \%$ |
| 5 | 267896 | 334074 | 966 | $0,8 \%$ |
| 6 | 334074 | 400252 | 127 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 7 | 400252 | 466430 | 28 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 466430 | 532608 | 9 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 532608 | 598786 | 5 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 598786 | 664968 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |



Figure 6: The Matrix - Size distribution for I, P and B frames

| Item | Count | Minimum | Maximum | Average | Std deviation |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 14541 | 3432 | 1895088 | 1019897 | 363358 |
| P | 55248 | 32 | 1459952 | 396579 | 98782 |
| B | 110396 | 24 | 1565960 | 184918 | 51664 |
| GOP | 14541 | 8912 | 10635840 | 4000410 | 806103 |

Table 12: New Year's Concert - Bitsizes for frames and GOPs

| GOP property | Number of GOPs | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Open GOPs | 14322 | $98 \%$ |
| Closed GOPs | 219 | $2 \%$ |
| GOPs with normal length (12) | 12292 | $85 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Largest frame $I$ | 13402 | $92 \%$ |
| Largest frame $P$ | 1079 | $7 \%$ |
| Largest frame $B$ | 60 | $0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| GOPs where $P>I$ | 3897 | $27 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>I$ | 2999 | $21 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>P$ | 2206 | $15 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $P>$ some previous $P$ in the GOP | 13566 | $93 \%$ |
| $B>$ some previous $B$ in the GOP | 13996 | $96 \%$ |

Table 13: New Year's Concert - GOP properties

| Item | Count | Minimum | Maximum | Average | Std deviation |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 8036 | 14392 | 819736 | 568826 | 116259 |
| P | 23929 | 32 | 764696 | 414148 | 48855 |
| B | 63747 | 32 | 423880 | 199928 | 26295 |
| GOP | 8036 | 80672 | 6412152 | 3396570 | 291106 |

Table 14: The Sea - Bitsizes for frames and GOPs

| GOP property | Number of GOPs | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Open GOPs | 8020 | $100 \%$ |
| Closed GOPs | 16 | $0 \%$ |
| GOPs with normal length (12) | 7674 | $95 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Largest frame $I$ | 7672 | $95 \%$ |
| Largest frame $P$ | 357 | $4 \%$ |
| Largest frame $B$ | 7 | $0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| GOPs where $P>I$ | 1317 | $16 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>I$ | 1532 | $19 \%$ |
| GOPs where $B>P$ | 333 | $4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $P>$ some previous $P$ in the GOP | 5872 | $73 \%$ |
| $B>$ some previous $B$ in the GOP | 7997 | $100 \%$ |

Table 15: The Sea - GOP properties


| Interval | From | To | Nr of P | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 146024 | 1866 | $3,4 \%$ |
| 2 | 146024 | 292016 | 2059 | $3,7 \%$ |
| 3 | 292016 | 438008 | 36194 | $65,5 \%$ |
| 4 | 438008 | 584000 | 13921 | $25,2 \%$ |
| 5 | 584000 | 729992 | 762 | $1,4 \%$ |
| 6 | 729992 | 875984 | 415 | $0,8 \%$ |
| 7 | 875984 | 1021976 | 27 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 1021976 | 1167968 | 2 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 1167968 | 1313960 | 0 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 1313960 | 1459952 | 2 | $0,0 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of B | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 24 | 156617 | 24255 | $22,0 \%$ |
| 2 | 156617 | 313210 | 85485 | $77,4 \%$ |
| 3 | 313210 | 469803 | 561 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 4 | 469803 | 626396 | 73 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 5 | 626396 | 782989 | 5 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 6 | 782989 | 939582 | 4 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 7 | 939582 | 1096175 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 8 | 1096175 | 1252768 | 6 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 1252768 | 1409361 | 0 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 1409361 | 1565960 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |



Figure 7: New Year's Concert - Size distribution for I, P and B frames

| Interval | From | To | Nr of I | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 14392 | 94926 | 134 | $1,7 \%$ |
| 2 | 94926 | 175460 | 36 | $0,4 \%$ |
| 3 | 175460 | 255994 | 51 | $0,6 \%$ |
| 4 | 255994 | 336528 | 71 | $0,9 \%$ |
| 5 | 336528 | 417062 | 102 | $1,3 \%$ |
| 6 | 417062 | 497596 | 1165 | $14,5 \%$ |
| 7 | 497596 | 578130 | 2480 | $30,9 \%$ |
| 8 | 578130 | 658664 | 2403 | $29,9 \%$ |
| 9 | 658664 | 739198 | 1267 | $15,8 \%$ |
| 10 | 739198 | 819736 | 289 | $3,6 \%$ |



| Interval | From | To | Nr of $P$ | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 76498 | 104 | $0,4 \%$ |
| 2 | 76498 | 152964 | 127 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 3 | 152964 | 229430 | 180 | $0,8 \%$ |
| 4 | 229430 | 305896 | 446 | $1,9 \%$ |
| 5 | 305896 | 382362 | 759 | $3,2 \%$ |
| 6 | 382362 | 458828 | 21526 | $90,0 \%$ |
| 7 | 458828 | 535294 | 781 | $3,3 \%$ |
| 8 | 535294 | 611760 | 1 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 9 | 611760 | 688226 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 688226 | 764696 | 2 | $0,0 \%$ |


| Interval | From | To | Nr of B | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32 | 42416 | 345 | $0,5 \%$ |
| 2 | 42416 | 84800 | 262 | $0,4 \%$ |
| 3 | 84800 | 127184 | 707 | $1,1 \%$ |
| 4 | 127184 | 169568 | 1924 | $3,0 \%$ |
| 5 | 169568 | 211952 | 42148 | $66,1 \%$ |
| 6 | 211952 | 254336 | 18096 | $28,4 \%$ |
| 7 | 254336 | 296720 | 200 | $0,3 \%$ |
| 8 | 296720 | 339104 | 57 | $0,1 \%$ |
| 9 | 339104 | 381488 | 4 | $0,0 \%$ |
| 10 | 381488 | 423880 | 3 | $0,0 \%$ |



Figure 8: The Sea - Size distribution for I, P and B frames

| Movie title | Avg size ratio | $I$ frames |  | $P$ frames |  | $B$ frames |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $I: P: B$ | average | std dev | average | std dev | average | std dev |
| Mission Impossible 2 | $4: 2: 1$ | 506109 | 187598 | 234821 | 109889 | 148204 | 57615 |
| Leaving Las Vegas | $6: 3: 2$ | 471886 | 140329 | 231145 | 76835 | 152435 | 45746 |
| Chicken Run | $6: 2: 1$ | 674549 | 216068 | 255551 | 133372 | 115185 | 53982 |
| The Usual Suspect | $4: 2: 1$ | 514744 | 174307 | 281867 | 92779 | 129537 | 48890 |
| The Matrix | $3: 2: 1$ | 430088 | 70920 | 249576 | 65226 | 136725 | 41336 |
| New Year's Concert | $6: 2: 1$ | 1019897 | 363358 | 396579 | 98782 | 184918 | 51664 |
| The Sea | $3: 2: 1$ | 568826 | 116259 | 414148 | 48855 | 199928 | 26295 |

Table 16: Comparrison of bitsize properties for all analysed movies

| Movie title | Number of GOPs where |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $I$ largest | $P$ largest | $B$ largest | $P>I$ | $B>I$ | $B>P$ |
| Mission Impossible 2 | $89 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Leaving Las Vegas | $94 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Chicken Run | $91 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| The Usual Suspect | $88 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| The Matrix | $93 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| New Year's Concert | $92 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| The Sea | $95 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Table 17: Comparisson of GOP properties for all analysed movies

## 4 Comments on analysis results

An overview of the movies we analyzed is summarized in table 16 and 17. Here we mach the most common assumptions about MPE video streams with our analysis results.

Assumption 1: - I frames are the largest and B frames are the smallest. This assumption holds on average. In all the movies that we analysed, the average sizes of the $I$ frames were larger than the average sizes of the $P$ frames, and $P$ frames were larger than $B$ frames on average, with frame size ratio $I: P: B=4: 2: 1$. Of course, the ratio depends also on the movie content, i.e., the ratio for the New Year's Concer movie that we analyzed was $6: 2: 1$, reflecting the fact that the we have a quite static background which is not cahnged often, so the difference between current frame and the next one gets smaller. In other words, we need less bits for predicted frames.

However, our analysis showed that this assumption is not valid for a significant number of cases. For example, in "The Usual Suspect" we have a case with $11 \%$ GOPs in which $P$ have the largest size, and $1 \%$ of $B$ frames, which corresponds roughly to 14 and 2 minutes of the movie. Clearly, such deviations from average cannot be ignored.

Assumption 2: - I frame is always the largest one in a GOP. This is not true. For example in the movie "Mission Impossible 2" the $P$ frame was larger than the $I$ frame in $31 \%$ of the GOPs. The $I$ frame might be the most important one in the GOP from the reconstruction point of view, but it does not necessarily has to be the largest one.

Assumption 3: - $B$ frames are always the smallest ones in a GOP. Neither this assumption is true. For example, in "Mission Impossible 2" a $B$ frame was largest in $1 \%$ of the cases. And in $39 \%$ of the cases, a $B$ frame was larger than all $P$ frames in the same GOP. This implies that even the assumption that $P$ frames are always larger than $B$ frames is also not valid. Another example is GOP nr 393 in "Mission Impossible 2" where the $B$ frame is almost 100 times larger than the $I$ frame ( $B \approx 1 M B, I \approx 12 k B$ ).

Assumption 4: - The sequence structure in a GOP is fixed to a specific $I, P, B$ frame pattern. Not true. In $23 \%$ of the GOPs in "Mission Impossible 2" the GOP length was not 12 frames. Not all GOPs consist of the same fixed number of $P$ and $B$ frames following the $I$ frame in a fixed pattern. That is because more advanced encoders will attempt to optimize the placement of the three picture types according to local sequence characteristics in the context of more global characteristics. For instance scene changes or large changes in video content do not occur regularly, and hence the need for $I$ frames in most video sequences is not at regular intervals.

Assumption 5: - Frame properties for all movies are the same. Neither this is true. Our analysis showed big variations between frame sizes, GOP pattern and the impact on the overall output video quality depending on the number of dropped frames. Different kinds of video will also effect the perceived quality of the video. For instance, the viewer will perceive jerky motion much easier if we drop frames in an action movie than in a cartoon.

Assumption 6: - B and P frames are sorted in a GOP according to their sizes in descending order. This is not true. There is no such an ordering within a GOP. As a matter of fact, our analysis showed that the largest $B$ frames are placed towards the end of the GOP. So, the "best-effort" algorithms will perform badly when skipping the last $B$ frames in the GOP.

Assumption 7: - All $B$ frames are equally important. Not true. $B$ sizes vary a lot. In our analysis we could see that e.g. in "Leaving Las Vegas" almost $90 \%$ of the $B$ frames is in a pretty large interval between 6000 and 300000 bits. So, if we drop a large $B$ frame, the entire GOP could be ruined. On the other hand, more bits does not necessarily mean better quality. That is because motion vectors give the highest compression ratio, but are smallest. So, a $B$ frame with a lot of motion vectors would have less data than some annother frame with more row picture information, but still give better output quality when decoded All this implies that selection of $B$ frames to be dropped should be performed carefully.

Assumption 8: - Frame sizes vary with minor deviations from the average value. Not true. For example, from figure 2 we can see that $88 \%$ of the $I$ frames has bitsize between 197737 and 790684 bits ( $\approx 200-800 \mathrm{kB}$ ), which is a quite large interval. The assumptions about MPEG based on average frame size will not hold in this case, since the significant number of frames will have twice as large repective twice as small bitsize, compared to the average frame size (which is $\approx 500 \mathrm{kB}$ ).
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